

**AUG 25 2006****NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

DARREL L. ESPINOSA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KARL RUDOLPH, an individual; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 05-16880

D.C. No. CV-04-00203-  
MCE/GGH

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Morrison C. England Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 21, 2006\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, REINHARDT, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Darrel L. Espinosa appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for failure to comply with court orders. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for abuse of discretion a

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

district court's dismissal for failure to comply with court orders and procedural rules, *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992), and we affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Espinosa's action on the ground that he failed to file an amended complaint within the period specified by the court and limited to specific facts to support his claim.

Espinosa's remaining contentions lack merit.

All pending motions are denied as moot.

Any requests for costs or attorneys' fees shall be made in accordance with the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1.

**AFFIRMED.**